

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application based on the foregoing amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

The Examiner asserts that the IDS filed on February 5, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. The Examiner states that it has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

In response, the applicant encloses herein a copy of the stamped postcard received from the USPTO showing that four Japanese references were received together with the USPTO Form 1449 on February 5, 2004.

Notwithstanding the evidence provided by the applicant, solely to expedite the prosecution of the application, the applicant herein resubmits as an Enclosure to this Response the four (4) references identified in the IDS filed on February 5, 2004.

At the outset, prior to addressing the rejections over the prior art, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that in order to enhance the recitation of the limitations of the present invention of claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the step of forming is performed by forming at least two scribe cracks only on the second face of said first sheet and only on the first face of said second sheet, said at least two scribe cracks intersecting each other on the second face of said first sheet and intersecting each other on the first face of said second sheet.

Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found in FIGS. 9A and 9B, which

disclose that the scribe cracks A to L are formed only on the second face of the first sheet and only on the first face of the second sheet, the at least two scribe cracks intersecting each other on the second face of the first sheet and intersecting each other on the first face of the second sheet.

Therefore, no new matter has been added by the amendment to claim 1.

With respect to the rejections over the prior art, in the current Official Action of April 12, 2004, the Examiner cites a new reference Nakahara et al (US 6,239,855 B1 - filed August 19, 1998 - issued May 29, 2001) in place of the Nishino et al reference. Therefore, the Examiner indicates that the Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 1 and 3**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Nakahara et al in view of Shishido et al, JP 9-311323, published December 2, 1997.

The Examiner asserts that in FIG. 21, Nakahara et al disclose intersecting scribe lines 64, adhering two substrates together, per column 2, line 49, via a seal layer 61 and via a dummy seal layer, auxiliary seal layer 62, and cutting the adhered substrate, per column 2, line 56.

The Examiner concedes that Nakahara et al do not disclose scribe cracks on the inner side of each substrate, i.e., second face of a first sheet and on a first face of a second sheet. However, the Examiner then asserts that Shishido et al in FIGS. 1 and 3 disclose scribe cracks (upper scribe blemish 11 and lower scribe blemish 24) on the outside or inside surface of a substrate. The Examiner asserts that the Abstract of Shishido discloses

that the object is to properly cut off liquid crystal cells without generating breakage and an oblique scratch in glass substrates. The Examiner concludes that therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a scribe crack on the inner surface of each substrate to cut the LCD cells without breakage.

In response, the applicant calls to the Examiner's attention that Nakahara et al disclose in FIG. 21 and in column 2, line 58, to column 3, line 9, a temporary securing section 63. Shishido et al, in FIG. 2, Step 201, disclose scribe lines 11 and 24, 11 on one face, and 24 on the opposite face, before a cutting step.

In contrast, the present invention of claim 1 recites forming at least two scribe cracks only on the second face of said first sheet and only on the first face of said second sheet, said at least two scribe cracks intersecting each other on the second face of said first sheet and intersecting each other on the first face of said second sheet.

The combination of Nakahara et al with Shishido et al would yield providing a scribe line on both the inner and outer faces of a pair of sheets to be fixed via a temporary securing section 63 inserted therebetween before cutting.

In contrast, the present invention recited by claim 1 provides scribe lines only on the inner faces of the two sheets. This method and arrangement permits even application of force when breaking the sheets, and results in a more accurately vertical crack. In addition, the distance from a seal to a severing section is shortened.

As a result, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Nakahara et al with those of Shishido et al. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art were somehow motivated to

combine the teachings of Nakahara et al with those of Shishido et al, the hypothetical device resulting from such a combination would not yield the advantages of the present invention of claim 1.

Consequently, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 3 over the prior art.

**35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections: Claims 2 and 4**

The Examiner has rejected claims 2 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) allegedly as being unpatentable over Nakahara et al in view of Shishido et al and/ or the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) FIG. 5A.

In response, in view of the arguments presented in favor of claim 1, neither Shishido et al nor the APA overcome the deficiencies of Nakahara et al with respect to claim 1.

Consequently, claims 2 and 4 patentably distinguish over the prior art. As a result, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of claims 2 and 4 over the prior art.

The foregoing amendment and remarks establish the patentable nature of all of the claims under consideration in the application, i.e., claims 1-4. No new matter has been added. Wherefore, early and favorable reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony N. Fresco  
Registration No. 45,784

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
516-742-4343/4366 FAX

ANF:nis

Enclosures:

1. Copy of postcard stamped on February 5, 2004 showing four (4) references and a Form 1449 having been received by the USPTO.
2. Copies of the four references, as follows:
  - a) Nishikawa Yukio, et al. Japanese Patent Abstract No. 03-258476, dated 11/18/91;
  - b) Izumi Yoshihiro, et al., Japanese Patent Abstract No. 11-160667, dated 6/18/99;
  - c) Iwane Takahiro, Japanese Patent Abstract No. 11-014953, dated 1/22/99; and
  - d) Ueda Makoto, Japanese Utility Model Application No. 53-041945, dated 4/11/78.